DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 089 610 HE 005 351

AUTHOR Endo, Russell
TITLE Asian Americans and Higher Education.
PUB DATE Mar 74
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwestern Sociological Association, March 1974

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Asian History; *Asian Studies; Chinese Culture; *Foreign Culture; *Higher Education; *Minority Groups; Non Western Civilization; Speeches
IDENTIFIERS *Asian Americans

ABSTRACT

Unfortunately the story of Asian Americans and higher education is not one of unqualified success. This paper attempts to overview the historical significance and present the problems of Asian Americans in higher education. The first problem is the lack of oral and writing skills among Asian Americans. Part of this problem is cultural, referring to traditional Asian values of obedience and subordination. A second problem is the stress resulting from pressures for high levels of school achievement from families and communities. A third problem area concerns the reluctance of universities to hire qualified Asian American administrators, faculty, and staff, to actively recruit Asian American graduate and professional school students, to provide financial assistance and support services in line with Asian American student needs, and to include the history, contributions, and problems in the college curriculum. Asian Americans are often not seen as legitimate minorities, either because of their small numbers in a particular locale, or because of their mobility in the middle class. Further work is needed to examine all the topics presented, but hopefully new research will be mindful of the general context outlined here. Reproduced from best available copy. (Author/PG)

ED 089610

Asian Americans and Higher Education

by

Russell Endo
Department of Sociology
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado 80302

Paper prepared for presentation at the Annual Meeting
of the Southwestern Sociological Association, March 1974.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ME003357

Asian Americans and Higher Education

For many people, Asian American minority groups evoke thoughts of elegant cuisine and mysterious communities filled with exotic curio shops, or perhaps politically-tinged reactions based upon the improvement in foreign relations with the People's Republic of China or upon the threat of Japanese economic competition. More knowledgeable individuals are likely to have a definite and positive image of these groups. They are seen as once-oppressed racial minorities that have attained some degree of success and are now assimilating into the American middle class, largely through their intelligence, patience, hard work, and resourcefulness. They are likely to be admired because they appear to have achieved upward mobility by their own efforts and through adherence to values that most Americans find admirable. This favorable image has received a good deal of attention in newspaper and magazine accounts which depict Asian Americans as "model minorities."[1]

The success image has come under heavy criticism from Asian Americans because it contains implied "lessons" to other minority groups on how progress should be made in American society. Furthermore, it ignores the high price that has been paid through past suffering and economic losses, the decline of traditional cultures and communities, and the uncritical acceptance of American values and beliefs. The success image overlooks existing community problems such as mental illness, crime and delinquency, confusion over cultural identity, the poverty of the aged, and continuing economic and social discrimination.[2] Perhaps most important, the new image of Asian Americans ignores the large segments of the population that live in abject poverty. For example, in the large Chinatown community of San Francisco, one third of the population lives below the poverty line, seventy-seven percent of the housing is substandard, the area is the

second most crowded residential neighborhood in the nation and has the highest rates of suicide and tuberculosis, it contains numerous garment shops where women work for very low wages, and it has grossly inadequate health, educational and social services.[3] The image of Asian American success has a certain validity, but the existence of major problems and the emergence of Asian American activism must temper any new stereotypes of success and notions of total assimilation.

Asian Americans have experienced considerable upward mobility since World War II. This is apparent in research that shows increasing proportions of Asian Americans in upper occupational categories and major gains in level of income.[4] Tables 1 and 2 from the 1970 census present indicators of the educational, income, poverty, and occupational status of Japanese, Chinese, and Filipino Americans as compared to other minority groups and to whites. The data reveal the extent to which Asian American groups have, in the aggregate, made progress along these dimensions. However these statistics mask many of the problems mentioned earlier as well as others. For instance, Chinese Americans exhibit a bimodal pattern in educational attainments, either having quite a bit or very little; in California 22% of Chinese Americans have completed four or more years of college while 35% have complete zero years of education.[5] Even well-educated Asian Americans are not evenly distributed throughout the range of upper occupational areas but tend instead to be concentrated in scientific-technical professions such as engineering, dentistry, optometry, and architecture. The reasons for this will be discussed later. Finally there is the disturbing fact that despite the usually high relationship between level of education and income, Asian Americans with higher levels of education than whites have in the aggregate lower levels of income.[6]

TABLES 1 AND 2 ABOUT HERE

These comments should serve to warn against viewing these and similar data as indications of complete Asian American success.

Although Asian American mobility can be attributed to many sources, previous research has emphasized the importance of high educational achievements, and especially the large proportions of Asian Americans that enter colleges and universities.[7] In order to understand the role of education beyond its association with other socioeconomic indicators, one must examine education as a part of the strategy developed by Asian American groups to cope with and survive in American society. Finally certain problem areas in higher education , often masked by attention given to high educational attainments, must be explored to complete the picture. This paper addresses itself to both of these concerns.

Asian American Strategy and Education

The term Asian American actually encompasses several ethnic groups each with distinct cultures, communities, and experiences. Together these groups today number about one and one-half million or 0.5% of the population. The major groups are the Japanese (591,290), Chinese (435,062), Filipinos (343,060), Hawaiians (106,760), and Koreans (96,927), with smaller numbers of Samoans and other Pacific and Southeast Asian peoples making up the remainder.[8] Asian Americans are heavily concentrated along the West and East coasts, but large numbers are also found in inland urban centers such as Chicago. Because more is known about them and because they are the largest groups, the discussion here will focus on the Chinese and Japanese Americans.

The Chinese came to America mainly during the period 1849 to 1882, but the passage of restrictive immigration legislation in the latter year did not entirely stop subsequent immigration.[9] Most early Chinese

came from the Canton area and considered themselves to be soujourners, or people who would merely work in Ameria until the day when they could return to China with their accumulated wealth. The desire for temporary residence, the high cost of passage, immigration restrictions, and the nature of most available labor employment all combined to limit the early immigration to young males. The imbalanced sex ratio in Chinese communities existed well into the twentieth century, and it was not until the 1920's and 1930's that large numbers of families were in evidence. Chinatowns were highly isolated communities due to the temporary status of many of its residents, the absence of families, the development of an intricate and partially self-sustaining networks of community institutions, and the racism exhibited by whites on the outside. A large American-born generation of Chinese emerged prior to World War II and formed the basis for an educated, new middle class in the years after 1945. With the influx of refugees and immigrants from Taiwan, Hong Kong, and the Mainland during the 1960's, Chinese communities today are composed of a blend of old single men, two or more generations of families, and new working class immigrants with backgrounds very different from those of the original migrants.

Most Japanese immigration to America occurred from 1890 to 1924, when an immigration act cut off the flow of newcomers.[10] Although some Japanese were also soujourners, others made the decision to settle in America and sent for wives. The communities created by the immigrant generation, the Issei, were oriented around family needs. The second generation, or Nisei, were born in the 1920's and 1930's. With the onset of World War II, 110,000 Japanese Americans were uprooted from their communities and sent to concentration camps. After the war, the Nisei

used their considerable energies and education to move into middle and upper range occupations. Upward mobility has continued to the present and the Nisei, and their Sansei children, have achieved a predominantly middle class status.

To the extent that it is possible to generalize about group strategies for adjusting to conditions in American society, the Nisei and the American-born Chinese followed a strategy of accomodation. Accomodation is a strategy of nonresistance, of avoiding confrontation with dominant groups, of progressing at one's own pace and through one's own initiative, always reacting and adapting to the obstacles posed by the larger society.[11] Accomodation means that an ethnic group adapts to a given set of conditions as best it can, and then prepares itself through training and hard work for the day when greater opportunities present themselves. The strategy requires an exceptional amount of patience, stoicism, and willingness to suffer rather than to aggressively resist injustice and fight for better opportunities. Accomodation has as its basis certain Asian cultural values that stress acquiescence, obediance, fatalistic resignation, and the willingness to suffer quietly. Given the extent of discrimination and violence visited upon the early immigrants, the strategy may have been a realistic and pragmatic one.[12] A key element of the accomodation strategy is educational achievement. Immigrant parents constantly proded their children to get good grades and to strive for a college education as a means of bettering their situation. The emphasis on education is revealed in the large numbers of Chinese and Japanese who went to colleges and universities, and of course is reflected in the present high aggregate levels of education for these groups. Fortunately

a decline in antiAsian racism after the war coupled with expanding economic opportunities allowed the well-trained Chinese and Japanese to move into white collar occupations and make the accomodation strategy work.

While young Asian American activists today criticize the accomodation strategy, pointing to the need for more politically assertive forms of group behavior, the stress on educational achievement has not abated. For example, in a pilot study conducted by the author among 508 Japanese American and white students in Seattle in 1971, 90% of the Japanese Americans as compared to 52% of the whites reported that they expected to continue on to a college education. Similarly, in a study of Japanese American secondary school students in Los Angeles, Audrey Schwartz notes that 85% aspire to a college education.[13] Whether high educational attainments will continue to be linked to group mobility, and whether they will persist even as new group strategies are developed are key issues for future research.[14]

Educational Problem Areas

Unfortunately the story of Asian Americans and higher education is not one of unqualified success. Several important problem areas must be examined to complete the picture. The first is the old but continuing problem of the apparent lack of oral and writing skills among Asian American students.[15] Students tend to fear and avoid verbal classroom participation, and to be hesistant, disorganized, and nervous when called upon to speak. Written work is often weak, rambling, and unimaginative. These characteristics perpetuate a stereotype of Asian Americans as quiet and unexpressive, and foreign in the sense that they have not appeared to have mastered the English language. Part of the problem is a deficiency in language skills which, in turn, is attributable to many

sources. Traditional Asian values that stressed obediance to authority, subordination and sensitivity to the wishes of others, conformity and fatalistic acquiescence to outside forces did not allow for, nor reward, the quality of discussion and interaction that would develop language skills. Imposed upon behavior within the family, these values again served to stifle interaction. Children were to be seen but not heard, and most communication was directed downward from parent to child. In many households, Chinese or Japanese was spoken, further diminishing the chance of developing facility with English. The existence of racism reinforced these cultural patterns by impressing upon the individual the importance of silence and inconspicuousness. In secondary schools and colleges, Asian American students were encouraged to enter fields requiring tactile or arithmetic skills, partly because some lacked facility with English, and partly because prevailing patterns of job discrimination were not as restrictive in scientific-technical occupations. Again verbalization was not always rewarded and once the stereotype of the quiet Asian American became widespread, it functioned as a self-fulfilling expectation both for students and teachers. Culture, racism, and schools had their impact not only in preventing facility with the English language, but also by promoting a lack of self confidence, inner strength, and positive sense of self that would lead to more assertive forms of behavior, including those related to communication.[16] Cultural patterns of obedience and acquiescence, backed by a racism that generated fear and denied the worth of Asian cultures and communities, and an educational system that ignored Asian contributions and stressed the virtues of white middle class America, all contributed to the development of weak, unassertive

individuals.

The problem with language still exists. For instance, Scholastic Aptitude Test verbal scores for Educational Opportunity Program Asian Americans at the University of Colorado average about 100 points below math scores.[17] And though many Asian Americans are moving into fields related to the humanities and social sciences, a strong emphasis on technical-scientific areas continues, perhaps because of existing language difficulties, or perhaps because of student, community, and counselor images based on past experience of the kinds of occupations "appropriate" for Asian Americans. A survey of students at the University of California-Davis noted that 58.8% of the Asian American undergraduates were majoring in the natural and physical sciences (compared to 38% of the nonAsians), and only 22% in the humanities and social sciences.[18] Similarly, a study at the University of California-Berkeley reported that 74.3% of American born Chinese males and 68% of American born Japanese males were going into engineering or the physical sciences.[19]

Students who perform poorly in classroom discussions or with written work are penalized by teachers who see this as evidence of inadequate preparation or a lack of intelligence. Serious emotional problems have surfaced where students, under pressure to get good grades, fail to perform satisfactorily in courses requring language skills, in spite of their best efforts. Partial remedies have been initiated in the form of counseling for Asian students and their instructors, and in the special English classes for Asian Americans created at the University of California-Berkeley and the University of Colorado. Obviously the seriousness and depth of the problem calls for more extensive solutions.

A second problem in higher education is the stress resulting from pressures for high levels of school achievement from families and communities. From an early age, an Asian American child is subject to strong family admonitions to do well in school. Parents take an intense interest in the progress of their children. Students are encouraged to win scholastic honors and to compete with one another for high grades. In addition, the student is constantly reminded of the value of a good education in a harsh and competitive world, and of the scarifices that his parents make so that he may attend school, especially at the college level. Chinese and Japanese communities back this concern for education by prominently publicizing the names of students that win high honors or achieve outstanding grades. This heightens the sense of competitiveness among students and makes student achievements an important source of individual and family status in the community.[20]

The stress that results from such pressures has come under attack by Asian American activists who question the validity and relevance of the educational institutions which are receiving so much attention, and the apparent preoccupation with mobility and assimilation of many who strive for high educational achievement. Psychologists and social workers have also commented on a variety of disorders that may stem from educational pressures ranging from acute tension and nervousness to serious mental illnesses. Since many Asian Americans are reluctant to seek help, the extent and nature of these disorders has only recently come to light.[21] Stresses and disorders are of course greatest for individuals who, for reasons of motivation or intelligence and aptitude, cannot meet high parental and community expectations. Problems are especially acute at the college level when students are forced to continue their education, often in specific fields of study, by their parents. Such students

seldom rebell for fear of social ostracism or the shame that such behavior might bring to themselves and their families. The stresses of education are sometimes compounded by cultural conflicts and serious questions about ethnic identity that come to light only when students leave their ethnic communities to attend predominantely white colleges. The absence of neighborhood socioemotional contacts, and the necessity of making major decisions such as the selection of a career or a marriage partner exacerbate educational and identity problems. Asian Americans have begun to address these concerns through counseling services in Educational Opportunity Programs and the extension of regular university psychiatric and counseling facilities. However many in need do not seek such assistance either because of an unawareness of the nature of their problems, a fear that assistance will stigmatize the individual, or because of feelings that one must be self reliant and quietly suffer through any difficulties that he faces.

A third problem area in higher education concerns the reluctance of universities to hire qualified Asian American adminstrators, faculty and staff, to actively recruit Asian American graduate and professional school students, to provide financial assistance and support services in line with Asian American student needs, and to ignore the history, contributions, and problems of Asian Americans in the college curriculum. These problems, of course, are faced by all minority groups, but several factors generally combine to make the situation worse for Asian Americans.

First, Asian American groups are often not seen as legitimate minorities, either because of their small numbers in a particular locale, or because they have achieved a certain amount of mobility into the middle class. This results in the exclusion of Asian Americans from whatever college programs, such as affirmative action or ethnic studies, that

might be mounted to alleviate educational problems. While Blacks and Chicanos are usually included automatically in minority programs, Asian Americans are called upon to "prove" their minority status, a difficult situation because of the absence of comprehensive research on the status of Asian American groups. The latter difficulty, in turn, is partly created by feelings that research on Asian American communities is somehow not as important or relevant as that concerning other minorities, which leads even Asian American scholars away from this topic, and is reinforced by the reluctance of funding agencies to provide research monies for such endeavors.

Second, there is sometimes an absence of support by local Asian American communities for the inclusion of Asian Americans in college minority programs because of feelings that such an identification may hurt the progress achieved by Asian American groups. Lack of support sometimes translates into active opposition as was mounted at the University of Colorado against the formation of an Asian American Educational Opportunity Program. Fortunately, in some instances, considerable support is forthcoming as in the case of demonstrations at Seattle Community College for the hiring of Asian American adminstrators.

A third difficulty faced by Asian Americans is that they are often the last campus minority group to make demands upon the adminstration. Being last sometimes has meant that administrators were already receptive to ethnic demands because of their past experience. More often however, being last has meant having to face intransigent adminstrators hardened by battles with other minority groups, or by concerns over declining university budgets. The result has usually been the exclusion of Asian Americans from many college efforts to alleviate minority educational

problems, or the establishment of programs that are underfunded, understaffed, and highly unstable, even by comparison to those of other minority groups. Another unfortunate occurrence has been the resistance on some campuses of other minority groups who resent what they consider to be a drain on already scarce resources. Being the last established with few resources has also meant that Asian American programs have not always been able to develop the constitutency of supporters, necessary "connections" and an understanding of budget and political processes, or the image of institutional permanence that would see them through crises.

A final difficulty for Asian Americans has to do with the composition of the groups lumped under the heading "Asian American." Although there are important similarities among Asian American ethnic groups, there are also major cultural and experiential differnces. These must be taken into account in college programs dealing with these groups. Given the small size of most Asian American programs, their task becomes almost an impossible one if they are to address different problems and needs for several Asian groups.

In conclusion it should be pointed out that even where Asian Americans have been accorded whatever small benefits that might accrue to other minority groups, their situation has not always improved. For instance, the inclusion of Asian Americans in some professional school affirmative action programs which have formal or informal group quotas has resulted in a net decrease in Asian American students, who were already overrepresented in the school population relative to their numbers in the local area prior to the implementation of affirmative action. Or it has also been the case in some schools that the number of qualified Asian Americans who could gain admittance under normal procedures exceeds that

allowed in under minority program policies. Also there has been a tendency to include foreign-born Asians as Asian Americans in administrative, faculty, and student censuses conducted by colleges. Since foreign-born Asians are sometimes present in significant numbers, especially among the faculty and students in the physical sciences, their inclusion gives the impression that Asian Americans are well represented. This creates problems for those working for the acceptance of Asian Americans in minority program efforts. On the one hand it is the case that the foreign-born are part of the minorities that come under the heading "Asian American." On the other hand, the experiences of the foreign-born are different from those born and raised in America, and colleges often use this expanded definition to deny further benefits to Asian Americans. Asian Americans have tended to use whichever form of the definition suits their immediate purposes, but the dilemma, at least in the abstract, remains.

Asian American Educational Programs

Partly in response to some of the preceeding problem areas, efforts were made beginning in 1968 to establish Asian American studies programs and Educational Opportunity Programs (EOP) on numerous college campuses. Though sometimes seen as being identical, the two do have different objectives. EOP programs are involved with minority student recruitment, with assistance in the areas of admission and financial assistance, and with the provision of support services such as counseling and tutoring. Although ethnic studies programs may perform some of the above functions, they are basically academic programs that concentrate on teaching and research. Both types of programs have experienced many of the difficulties described in the previous section. In addition, Asian American studies programs have had to deal with other problems.

Like other ethnic studies programs, Asian American studies have presented a challenge to higher education, both in terms of the biases in its perspectives that have lead to a disregard or devaluation of minority group experiences in teaching and research, and in terms of the lack of relevance of academic knowledge for individual students and their communities.[22] Ethnic studies proponents view themselves as asking new questions and generating new perspectives that will stimulate research and result in the elimination of biases from the body of knowledge concerning minority groups. Since 1968, Asian American programs have been initiated on scores of campuses, especially in California and on the East Coast. But with several outstanding exceptions to the contrary, most programs are relatively small in terms of course offerings, size of staff, and student enrollment. The objectives of studies programs are diverse and often a particular program reflects different concerns at various points in time or even simultaneously. One objective has been a focus on the individual and his ethnic identity, with its concern for exploration of historical materials and social psychological topics such as cultural conflict, alienation, and personality development. Another objective has moved beyond a preoccupation with problems in the college itself to those of Asian American communities on the outside. Student involvement on this level has taken the form of community action research, and internships in community-based service programs or other forms of practical experience supplemented by coursework taken as a preparation for these kinds of activities. The development of distinctively Asian American cultural patterns through creative writing, artwork, filmmaking and similar pursuits is another discernable goal of studies programs. Some programs have political concerns that are manifested in the creation of left ideologies and critiques of American institutions, or in political activity in conjunction with the

resolution of local community problems, or in attempts to influence the policies of legislative bodies concerned with higher education. Examples of latter are the report, Asian Americans in Public Higher Education, prepared for a California state legislative committee, and the participation of Asian Americans on governmental bodies such as the Washington State Commission on Asian American Affairs. Studies programs have also been involved with the development of curriculum materials for colleges and public schools, and with the dissemination of information through commissions, conferences, and workshops concerned with education. Finally another program objective has been the generation of scholarly research on the nature and status of Asian American groups.

The plethora of objectives being addressed by Asian American studies programs has been a source of problems. A major debate centers around the development of academic programs versus a greater involvement in local community problems. Other clevages are apparent because of particular ideological perspectives that have emerged, especially in regard to this debate. Studies programs are currently under attack by community activistsfor their neglect of concrete community problems, by academicians for their lack of scholarly rigor and attention to research, and by college administrators anxious to eliminate what they view as extraneous programs. The underfunding and understaffing of most programs, the lack of certain curriculum materials, and the absence of coordination between programs further serve to place Asian American studies in a precarious position.

The possible decline of Asian American studies and EOP programs will be felt beyond the college environment. Asian American programs, whatever their objectives, have served as integral parts of the emerging

activism in Asian American communities.[23] Unlike the community activism of perhaps any other minority group, the Asian American "movement" in communities has relied very heavily on campus programs for students, funds, materials, and even ideologies. Sometimes this relationship has been a direct one, as in the case where studies programs provide opportunities for student participation in community efforts such as legal or medical clinics, social service organizations, or artistic collectives. At other times the relationship has been less direct. For instance, studies programs may sensitize students to community problems and stimulate a concern for immediate service or for future community activity as teachers, social workers, or community organizers. This reliance on campus programs was probably greater in past years than today as community activists are finding their own sources of manpower, resources, and rationales. To a certain extent, differences between working or lower class "street" activists and middle class students have created conflicts and placed the latter in a very marginal position within some communities. Nevertheless, communities are still affected by Asian American programs at colleges, and any decline in these programs will be felt in Asian American communities.

Conclusion

This paper has attempted to overview the significance and problems in higher education for Asian Americans. The picture is one of a mixture, of high levels of achievement alongside serious problem areas, of accomodation strategies and a new sense of militance, of mobility and an attempt to reach out for ethnic identity and a new sense of community. Further work is needed to examine all of the topics presented, but hopefully new research will be mindful of the general context outlined here.

Footnotes

1. See for example: Newsweek, June 21, 1971, pp. 24-25; U.S. News and World Report, December 26, 1966, pp. 73-73; William Petersen, "Success Story: Japanese American Style," New York Times Magazine, January 9, 1966, pp. 20-21.

2. For discussions of these problem areas see: Stanley Sue and Nathaniel Wagner, eds., Asian Americans: Psychological Perspectives, Ben Lomond, Calif: Science and Behavior Books, 1973; Report to the Governor on Discrimination Against Asians, Olympia: Washington State Asian American Advisory Council, 1973; Chinese in San Francisco, 1970: Employment Problems of the Community as Presented in Testimony Before the California Fair Employment Practices Commission, San Francisco: California Fair Employment Practices Commission, 1970; Robert Yoshioka et al., Asian Americans and Public Higher Education in California, Sacramento: Joint Commission on the Master Plan for Higher Education, 1973; Bernard B. Berk and Lucie Cheng Hirata, "Mental Illness Among the Chinese: Myth or Reality," Journal of Social Issues, 29(1973), pp. 149-166; Richard A. Kalish and Sharon Moriwaki, "The World of the Elderly Asian American," Journal of Social Issues, 29(1973), pp. 187-209.

3. Victor Nee and Brett deBary Nee, Longtime Californ', New York: Pantheon, 1973; Stanford M. Lyman, Chinese Americans, New York: Random House, 1974, pp. 809-819.

4. Calvin F. Schmid and Charles E. Nobbe, "Socioeconomic Differentials Among Nonwhite Races," American Sociolgical Review, 30(1965), pp. 910-913; Barbara F. Varon, "The Japanese Americans: Comparative Occupational Status, 1960 and 1950," Demography, 4(1967), pp. 809-819.

5. Californians of Japanese, Chinese and Filipino Ancestry, San Francisco: California Department of Industrial Relations, 1969, p. 25.

6. Schmid and Nobbe, "Socioeconomic Differentials Among Nonwhite Races," pp. 910-913 and 917-921. For additional comments on census data, especially concerning educational attainments, see Yoshioka, Asian Americans and Public Higher Education in California.

7. Lyman, Chinese Americans, pp. 120-188; Betty Lee Sung, Mountain of Gold, New York: Macmillan, 1967, pp. 233-285; Isao Horinouchi, Educational Values and Preadaption in the Acculturation of the Japanese Americans, Sacramento: Sacramento Anthropological Society, 1967; Audrey J. Schwartz, "Traditional Values and Contemporary Achievement: The Case of Japanese-American Pupils," Center for the Study of Evaluation, University of California-Los Angeles; Audrey J. Schwartz, "The Culturally Advantaged: A Study of Japanese-American Pupils," Sociology and Social Research 55(1971), pp. 341-353; Gene N. Levine and Darrel Montero, "Socioeconomic Mobility Among Three Generations of Japanese Americans," Journal of Social Issues, 29(1973), pp. 33-48; Darrel Montero, "Assimilation and Educational Achievement: The Case of The Second Generation Japanese American," paper presented at the 1973 Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association.

8. Data from 1970 census. See citation on Tables 1 and 2.

9. General discussions of Chinese American history are presented in Lyman, Chinese Americans; and Nee and Nee, Longtime Californ'.

10. General discussions of Japanese American history are presented in: William Petersen, Japanese Americans, New York: Random House, 1971; Bill Hosokawa, Nisei, New York: Morrow, 1969; and Harry H.L. Kitano, Japanese Americans: Evolution of a Subculture, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

11. Kitano, Japanese Americans, pp. 2-3.

12. This does not imply that there was no active resistance to racism and discrimination. See for example: Karl Yoneda, "One Hundred Years of Japanese Labor in the U.S.A.," in Amy Tachiki et al., Roots: An Asian American Reader, Los Angeles: Asian American Studies Center, 1971; Yuji Ichioka, "A Buried Past: Early Issei Socialists and the Japanese Community," Amerasia Journal, 2(1971), pp. 1-25.

13. Schwartz, "The Culturally Advantaged: A Study of Japanese American Pupils," p. 345.

14. Current research is focused not on the importance of education, but on the sources of the emphasis on educational achievement, whether these are to be found in traditional values or in the acculturation to white middle class values. See the sources under note #7.

15. Colin Watanabe, "Self-Expression and the Asian American Experience," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 51(1973), pp. 390-396; Edward Kaneshige, "Cultural Factors in Group Counseling and Interaction," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 51(1973), pp. 407-412.

16. This is the major arguement in Watanabe, "Self-Expression and the Asian American Experience," pp. 390-396.

17. Stuart Takeuchi, xeroxed memorandum to the University of Colorado School of Law, March 1974.

18. Yoshioka, Asian Americans and Public Higher Education in California, p. 14.

19. Watanabe, "Self-Expression and the Asian American Experience," p. 390.

20. See for example: Frank Miyamoto, "Social Solidarity Among the Japanese in Seattle," University of Washington Publications in the Social Sciences, 2(1939), pp. 104-112; Watanabe," Self-Expression and the Asian American Experience," pp. 394-395.

21. Stanley Sue and Derald Wing Sue, "Chinese American Personality and Mental Health," Amerasia Journal 2(1971), pp. 36-49; Derald Wing Sue and Stanley Sue, "Counseling Chinese Americans," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 50(1972), pp. 637-644.

22. For further discussion of Asian American studies programs see: Russell Endo, "Whither Ethnic Studies: A Reexamination of Some Issues," in Stanley Sue and Nathaniel N. Wagner, eds., Asian Americans: Psychological Perspectives, Ben Lomond, Calif: Science and Behavior Books, 1973; Isao Fujimoto, "Unmasking of A Facade," Bridge 2(1973), pp. 8-10; Dennis Torigoe, "Which Way," Bridge 2(1973), pp. 6-8; George Kagiwada and Isao Fujimoto, "Asian American Studies: Implications for Education," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 51(1973),

pp. 400-405.

23. For a further discussion of Asian American activism see: Paul Wong, "The Emergence of the Asian American Movment," Bridge, 2(1972), pp. 32-39; Amy Tachiki et al., Roots: An Asian American Reader.

Table 1

Income, Education, and Poverty Status of Asian Americans, Other Minority Groups, and Whites

	Japanese	Chinese	Filipinos	Blacks	Chicanos*	Native Americans	Whites
Median Education (in years)	12.5	12.4	12.2	9 8	8.1	9.8	12.1
Median Family Income	$12,515	$10,610	$9,318	$6,063	$6,962	$5,832	$9,961
Persons Below Poverty Line	7.5%	13.3%	13.7%	34.8%	27.7%	38.3%	10.9%

Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Subject Reports PC(2)-1C, PC(2)-1F, PC(2)-1B, PC(2)-1G, PC(1)-1C, 1970.

*Persons of Spanish Origin-Mexican Descent (excludes persons of Spanish Origin of Cuban and Puerto Rican descent).

Table 2

Occupational Status of Asian Americans, Other Minority Groups, and Whites

Occupations-Males Only	Japanese	Chinese	Filipinos	Blacks	Chicanos**	Native Americans	Whites
Professional-Technical	23%	31%	21%	6%	5%	10%	15%
Managerial-Administr.	14	15	4	3	5	6	9
Sales Workers	6	4	2	2	3	2	8
Clerical	8	7	9	8	5	5	18
Craftsmen-Foremen	21	8	15	17	24	24	14
Operatives	8	10	15	31	28	24	17
Laborers, Nonf.	9	2	7	15	12	12	4
Farmers	4	1	1	1	1	3	2
Laborers, Farm	2	*	8	3	8	4	1
Service Workers	5	21	19	14	9	9	10
Pvt. Household Wkrs.	*	*	*	*	*	*	1

Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Subject Reports PC(2)-1C, PC(2)-1F, PC(2)-1B, PC(2)-1G, PC(1)-1C, 1970.

*less than 1%

**Persons of Spanish-Origin-Mexican Descent (excludes persons of Spanish Origin of Cuban and Puerto Rican descent).